

Duval County Public Schools

Seabreeze Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	24
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Seabreeze Elementary School

1400 SEABREEZE AVE, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

<http://www.duvalschools.org/seabreeze>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Seabreeze Elementary, we aspire to build a foundation for lifelong learning by fostering individual growth. We provide unique opportunities for developing leadership skills, critical thinking, and creative expression. We want our Seahorses empowered, prepared and fulfilled.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Seabreeze Elementary strives to provide a positive, engaging and thoughtful environment that will reach the whole child every day.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Kimball, Aimee	Principal	
Coffman, Carly	Assistant Principal	
Johnson, Karen	Other	
Mercer, Erin	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Mullins, Caran	Behavior Specialist	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The SIP will be reviewed and input given during School Advisory Council.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Seabreeze will utilize baselines for beginning of year data, and track quarterly through District assessments. Target students will be identified by baseline data, and given projections and growth expectations to align with our SIP. Our PBIS goal will be reviewed, discussed, and revised as needed. The school will hold monthly PBIS meetings to ensure goals are met.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	36%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	54%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	18	22	23	19	17	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	6	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	18	12	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	8	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	19	31	29	0	0	0	0	0	82
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	14	14	13	15	10	0	0	0	68

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	33	23	26	28	1	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	3	5	6	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	7	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	10	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	21	23	30	25	26	0	0	0	125
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	33	23	26	28	1	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	3	5	6	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	1	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	7	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	10	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	21	23	30	25	26	0	0	0	125
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	65	48	53	69	50	56	72		
ELA Learning Gains				67			66		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			37		
Math Achievement*	75	58	59	73	48	50	76		
Math Learning Gains				65			70		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45			50		
Science Achievement*	68	52	54	65	59	59	71		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	70
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	280
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	439
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	44			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	2	1
HSP	77			
MUL	47			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	47			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	41			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP	73			
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	53			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	65			75			68					
SWD	41			49			40				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32			39			21				3	
HSP	71			83							2	
MUL	33			60							2	
PAC												
WHT	74			83			85				4	
FRL	40			48			46				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	69	67	55	73	65	45	65					
SWD	34	60	50	48	43	20	30					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	55	57	26	48	40	15					
HSP	74	56		83	80							
MUL	50			58								
PAC												
WHT	81	71	62	84	69		81					
FRL	52	58	56	52	52	52	46					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	72	66	37	76	70	50	71					
SWD	34			48								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	64		38	55		50					
HSP	81			81								
MUL	58			50								
PAC												
WHT	79	71	45	84	75	55	75					
FRL	55	45		56	55	40	59					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	61%	47%	14%	54%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	50%	14%	58%	6%
03	2023 - Spring	68%	46%	22%	50%	18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	72%	59%	13%	59%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	58%	27%	61%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	67%	52%	15%	55%	12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	67%	48%	19%	51%	16%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Our ELA proficiency showed a decline across grades 3-5. We did notice an increase in new students who had not attended school since 2019/2020 school year, and came in multiple years behind.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Fifth grade Math proficiency decreased by 12%. We believe attendance and the academic gaps from missing 1-2 school years factored to this decline, particularly in our bottom quartile. 5th grade had one-third of their students enter (or arrive) as non-proficient. Fourth grade ELA proficiency decreased by 9% points. This grade level had fewer enter after being absent for multiple years, but they did have several students that struggled with attendance.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Not available at this time

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

4th grade Math proficiency showed the most improvement, 15% points. New actions included moving a 5th grade Math/Science teacher down to 4th grade. The two teachers worked together well to plan and deliver effective instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

We have a substantial attendance concern, as all grades 1-5 have 20% of students missing 10% or more instructional days. As we create our PBIS goals, attendance intervention and rewards will have to be considered.

We also have a large number of students that have achieved a Level 1 on ELA F.A.S.T. assessment. 19% of our 4th graders and 14% of our 5th graders will need effective Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. 4th/5th grade ELA Proficiency
2. LPQ Gains in both ELA and Math
3. 5th grade Math gains
4. School culture and climate, particularly with creating a culturally responsive environment for at-risk students with multiple EWS.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

4th and 5th Grade ELA Proficiency

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Seabreeze Elementary will increase grade 3-5 ELA proficiency by at least 3% per grade level, as measured by the F.A.S.T. 2024 assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored through the use of District and in-house assessments, frequent data monitoring, including student and teacher data chats. Effective use of Tier 1 supports and implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will also be monitored to ensure these proficiency targets are met.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aimee Kimball (kimballa1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Dedicate focus of weekly common planning to include full implementation of standards-based instruction and common assessment.
2. Increase vertical planning opportunities to allow for increased 4th/5th grade instructional collaboration.
3. Improve Tier 1 supports through common planning and professional development.
4. Increased monitoring and feedback on small group lesson plans, with an emphasis on Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports.
5. Improve instructional enrichment opportunities to ensure the advancement and retainment of current proficient students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As teachers have increased opportunity to plan for instruction, their instructional delivery will improve. We are also including support staff to attend these planning opportunities, in order to ensure that the needs of all learners are met. Data will justify instructional decision making, and will support the rationale for interventions or extensions for specific learners.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Collect and monitor lesson plans with fidelity

Person Responsible: Carly Coffman (culbrethc@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly

Data driven lesson plans to ensure quality core instruction and effective use of Tier 1 supports

Person Responsible: Aimee Kimball (kimballa1@duvalschools.org)

By When: weekly

Maximize use of common planning and vertical planning opportunities to increase collaboration between grade levels and departments.

Person Responsible: Aimee Kimball (kimballa1@duvalschools.org)

By When: weekly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Improve ELA and Math learning gains among our lowest-performing quartile

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Seabreeze Elementary will achieve results of 50% or greater in the areas of Reading and Math LPQ gains.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored through the use of monitored CPST/MTSS procedures, including the use of Tier 1 supports and implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions. Frequent data monitoring will assist in ensuring the LPQ students are showing gains throughout the academic year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aimee Kimball (kimballa1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Data driven small group planning, including VE teachers and classroom paraprofessionals.
2. Inclusive common planning, to allow LPQ support staff to collaborate with classroom teachers.
3. Additional vertical planning to provide additional professional development on Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports.
4. Differentiated small group plans with feedback on implementation and results.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Involving LPQ support staff into planning and delivery opportunities alongside our classroom teachers will ensure clarity and purpose during instruction and remediation. Our general education teachers will also benefit from this collaboration, by learning how to effectively implement additional intervention resources during small group. We have worked diligently to identify and service at-risk students through strengthened MTSS measures. This practice will continue.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Data driven intervention groups to determine small group instruction and allocation of appropriate resources, created through common planning and problem solving team.

Person Responsible: Aimee Kimball (kimballa1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly

Monitoring and completion of CPST/MTSS process for identified at-risk students

Person Responsible: Karen Johnson (johnsonk13@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Collect and monitor lesson plans with fidelity, with attention and feedback for how small group instruction is implemented during both centers and core.

Person Responsible: Carly Coffman (culbrethc@duvalschools.org)

By When: weekly

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

5th grade Math proficiency

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

5th grade Math will maintain or improve proficiency by at least 3% as measured by the F.A.S.T. assessments.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored through the use of District and in-house assessments, frequent data monitoring, including student and teacher data chats. Effective use of Tier 1 supports and implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will also be monitored to ensure these proficiency targets are met.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. Dedicate focus of weekly common planning to include full implementation of standards-based instruction and common assessment, including the common practice of ALDs and EEAs.
2. Increase vertical planning opportunities to allow for increased 4th/5th grade instructional collaboration.
3. Improve Tier 1 supports through common planning and professional development.
4. Increased monitoring and feedback on small group lesson plans, with an emphasis on Tier 2 and Tier 3 supports. There is a need for updated, aligned standards-based interventions in Mathematics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our students need increased exposure to standards-based assessment item types. This includes the common practice of using ALDs to master content fully, as well as exposure to equivalent experience assessment questions (EEAs).

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Plan and deliver effective common planning opportunities for all instructional personnel

Person Responsible: Carly Coffman (culbrethc@duvalschools.org)

By When: weekly

Ensure delivery of standards-based instruction, EEA assessment items, and usage of ALD (achievement level descriptors) in all Mathematics classrooms.

Person Responsible: Aimee Kimball (kimballa1@duvalschools.org)

By When: weekly

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Many of our students that have chronic attendance issues are also impacted by behavioral concerns, academic motivation, or academic success.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Seabreeze Elementary will improve its overall attendance rate by 5%.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Daily monitoring of attendance, implementation of attendance rewards, effective PBIS processes to encourage attendance in the classroom, additional training for classroom teachers to support students with transportation barriers. Admin, guidance, and records clerk will continue to monitor and track chronic attendance issues through the ALT (attendance team).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aimee Kimball (kimballa1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Attendance rates, PBIS lesson plans, PBIS professional development, ALT agendas and meetings, attendance referrals

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Holding families accountable for their children's attendance rate is paramount. All students must feel welcome and safe while at school, justifying the need for all teachers to receive positive behavior support training. Teachers also need to feel equipped to handle students with an increasing amount of barriers, so that they are able to focus on their instructional impact.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Monitor attendance through collaboration with CRT and FOCUS reporting

Person Responsible: Carly Coffman (culbrethc@duvalschools.org)

By When: daily

Reinforce positive behavior supports and implement positive attendance tracking systems for all classrooms through PBIS professional development.

Person Responsible: Caran Mullins (mullinasc@duvalschools.org)

By When: monthly

Hold monthly ALT intervention meetings with at-risk families, working to overcome any barriers that may prevent students from attending.

Person Responsible: Aimee Kimball (kimballa1@duvalschools.org)

By When: monthly

Our school PBIS team will celebrate and reward attendance, as well as model behavior in common areas.

Person Responsible: Aimee Kimball (kimballa1@duvalschools.org)

By When: monthly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

When the school receives SIP funds, the School Advisory Council assists in the decision making for how the funds are to be utilized. Teachers and staff generally put forward requests or needs, and SAC and administration work to ensure the best investment is made.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes